



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,578	07/31/2006	Julie Baker	87407CPK	3055

1333 7590 12/08/2009
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

MARTIN, LAURA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2853

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/08/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haruta et al. (JP 58-136482 A) in view of Iwasa et al. (US 2002/0012786 A1).

Haruta et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: an ink jet receiver comprising a voided polymer ink-receiving layer (figure 3, element 1); printing an image onto an ink jet receiver using a printer to generate a print and applying pressure and/or heat to the print before or after the step of coating and thereby improving the surface properties (constitution), the heat creating a reaction that causes the foaming in the resin layer, wherein the voided polymer ink-receiving layer is a foamed hydrophilic polymer ink-receiving layer.

Haruta et al. do not specifically disclose loading the ink jet printer with an ink jet receiver; however, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that if an image was formed onto a receiver by means of an ink jet printer, the receiver must be loaded into the printer.

As per claim 2: the application of pressure and/or heat to the print reduces the roughness and increases the gloss of the surface of the print (constitution – melting reduces roughness by allowing the surface to disperse evenly).

As per claim 9: the application of pressure and/or heat to the print is carried out using a fusing device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that if the top layer was melted, it would be fused together in some way. The device that causes this melting would be the fusing device.

As per claim 10: an ink jet print (purpose).

Haruta et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: the voided polymer ink-receiving layer is a foamed hydrophilic polymer ink-receiving layer obtainable by coating a support with a solution containing a hydrophilic polymer and a blowing agent, and interacting with the solution to cause said blowing agent to generate gas bubbles within said solution causing the foaming of said hydrophilic polymer.

As per claim 5: the polymer is selected from PVA, PEO, PVP, and gelatin.

Iwasa et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 1: the voided polymer ink-receiving layer is a foamed hydrophilic polymer [0012] (the claim has no limitation as to the amount of hydrophilic polymer, nor does it claim the absence of a hydrophobic polymer within it) ink-receiving layer obtainable by coating a support with a solution containing a hydrophilic polymer and a blowing agent, and interacting with the solution to cause said blowing agent to generate

Art Unit: 2853

gas bubbles within said solution causing the foaming of said hydrophilic polymer [0053] – [0054].

As per claim 5: the polymer is selected from PVA, PEO, PVP, and gelatin [0018].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Haruta et al. with the disclosure of Iwasa et al. in order to provide higher quality images through faster ink drying.

As per claim 8: Haruta et al. as modified discloses the claimed invention except for the weight of a blowing agent is about 10% to about 60%. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the amount of the blowing agent in the ink composition, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/27/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the references cited do not teach the use of a foamed hydrophilic polymer ink receiving layer obtained by coating a support with a solution comprising a hydrophilic polymer and a blowing agent, and either before or after the

Art Unit: 2853

step of coating, interacting with the solution to cause the blowing agent to generate gas bubbles within the solution causing the foaming of the hydrophilic polymer. The examiner disagrees

Hatasa et al. disclose the coating of a porous resin layer onto an ink recording sheet. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this resin layer would have to be coated onto the sheet somehow. The applicant does not limit "coating," such that it could be any form of placing one layer on top of another. Hatasa et al. also disclose interacting with the solution to cause the blowing agent to generate gas bubbles within the solution causing the foaming of the resin polymer (the light creates the pores; obviously the blowing agent, when exposed to light and heat, would react to cause the porous film.

Iwasa et al. disclose a solution comprising a hydrophilic polymer and a blowing agent. The porous resin film is obviously mixed with the foaming agent that is taught in [0054], as a foaming agent would need to be mixed with the substrate in order for it to cause the pores to form. Iwasa et al. disclose a hydrophilic polymer in [0012]. The claim does not specify the amount or need for the resin to be only comprised of a hydrophilic polymer, thus this satisfies the claim language. Iwasa et al. also discloses interacting with the solution to cause the blowing agent to generate gas bubbles within the solution causing the foaming of the hydrophilic polymer. In [0054], Iwasa et al. disclose that a foaming agent can be used to create the pores; while stretching is the preferred method, it still can occur through a foaming agent. While it is less preferred, it is still taught as a possible method of creating a porous resin, and as such, overcomes

Art Unit: 2853

the claim language when modifying Hatasa et al. The resin film would have to be coated onto the substrate in some form as discussed above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA E. MARTIN whose telephone number is (571)272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2853

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. E. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2853

/Stephen D Meier/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2853